

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claim 3 is amended. Claims 2-9 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Sever, for the courtesies extended Applicant's representative on June 21, 2006 during a personal interview. To overcome this rejection, the Examiner suggested amending the claims to improve their clarity. Claim 3 is amended to respond to the Examiner's suggestions proposed during the interview. The following remarks incorporate Applicant's summary of the interview.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection and during the interview conducted with Examiner Sever. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

**I. Election/Restriction**

In paragraph 2 on page 2, the Office Action indicates that a complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of non-elected claims or other appropriate action.

Applicant respectfully points out that the withdrawn claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 currently depend from independent claim 3, which is an elected claim. As the rejection of the elected claims is overcome as discussed below, it is believed that claim 3 is in condition for

allowance. As a result, the withdrawn claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 should be rejoined and also allowed.

**II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Office Action rejected claims 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0012103 A1 to Cho et al. (Cho). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the interview, the Examiner agreed that Cho fails to disclose or suggest that each of the display element is disposed of a single color. However, the Examiner requested that the claims be amended to clearly define the feature. Claim 3 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. These amendments do not change the scope of claims nor affect the patentability of the claims.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Cho describes a projection-type image display apparatus that provides an image by focusing an image formed by display devices 171, 173 on a screen using light emitted from a light source 110. The projection-type image display apparatus includes the light source 110, a color separation unit 120, a lens array 130, driving portions 140, transmission-type display devices 171, 173 and a projection lens unit 180 (Fig. 2).

Cho does not provide individual display elements for each of the colors. Instead, Cho forms an image by alternately projecting the red (R), green (G), and blue (B) color beams onto individual pixels of a single display device 171 or 173. Cho projects the red (R), green (G), and blue (B) color stripes on the display devices 171 and 173 according to the operation of the driving portion 140. The driving portion 140 moves lens array 130 so that the beams can alternately enter respective pixels of the display devices 171 and 173. As shown in Figs. 8A-10A and 8B-10B, moving the lens array 130 causes a center line to be positioned on the left side, right side or in alignment with a reference line. The position of the center line

determines the order in which the separated beams (R), (G) and (B) is projected onto the display devices 171 and 173 (paragraphs [0042]-[0046] of Cho).

Cho uses the display device 171 to process p-polarized beams and the display device 173 to process s-polarized beams, in similar manners. Thus, Cho forms its image by alternately projecting all three colors onto either display device 171 or 173. In contrast, the invention provides individual display elements 250R, 250G and 250B for each color, for example, as shown in Figs. 6-7 and discussed in paragraphs [0094]-[0097].

Therefore, Cho does not teach or suggest claim 3.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 3 is patentable over Cho. Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 3, and thus also are patentable over Cho for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on Cho is respectfully requested.

### **III. Conclusion**

Claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 depend from claim 3, and thus also are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Because claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 include all features of claim 3, rejoinder of claims 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 is respectfully requested upon allowance of independent claim 3.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-9 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Dinnatia J. Doster-Greene

Registration No. 45,268

JAO:DJG

Date: July 17, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461